

Atty. Docket No.: ORTV.P003

Patent 09/872,485

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 10 and 14 are amended herein. Claims 6 and 15 have been canceled without prejudice. No claims have been allowed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 6, 10, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Martin Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent 6,610,105), hereinafter "Martin". Claims 6 and 15 have been canceled without prejudice. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, and 10 are not anticipated by Martin.

Martin discloses techniques to facilitate participation of mobile devices in accessing resources over a data network.

Martin seeks to provide a similar World-Wide Web, or Internet navigation experience to users of personal computer (PCs) and users of mobile devices, such as cell phones. For example, a mobile navigation metaphor (e.g., 3A. element 302) is provided so that a user can have a similar navigation experience on both mobile devices and personal computers. (column 4, lines 43-51). Martin also seeks to disclose a server that can distinguish between requesting devices so that returned content is suitable for the requesting device. (column 3, lines 38-46).

Applicants respectfully observe that Martin is limited to facilitating Internet navigation (browsing) using mobile devices. For example, Martin discloses a screen display for a mobile device (Figure 3B) in which each item is a descriptive hyperlink representing a category of content. (column 9, lines 16-24). Martin also discloses a mobile navigation metaphor displayed on a PC screen (Figure 3A) to enable a user to better understand the menu structure of both the PC and the mobile device menu interfaces, and to more efficiently navigate to a desired source of information by reinforcing the navigation experience using two different devices. (column 8, lines 50-59).

Atty. Docket No.: ORTV.P003

Patent 09/872,485

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 as amended is not anticipated by Martin. Martin does not disclose a configuration list as in claim 1 ("each user configuration list including information identifying a user and information identifying one or more applications programs associated with the user"). The Office Action states:

Regarding claim 6, Martin Jr. et al. further discloses the method claimed in claim 1 wherein the step of storing in the intermediate system identifications of users (# 128 fig. 2B) and lists of application programs (fig.4B) and remote systems associated with the users comprises storing user configuration lists (fig. 2B-4A, col. 9 line 38 thru col. 11 line 28), each user configuration list including information identifying a user and information identifying one or more application programs associated with the user (fig. 2B-4A, col. 7 line 33 thru col. 8 line 6, and col. 9 line 38 thru col. 11 line 28).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of the Martin disclosure. For example, Figure 4B shows lists of descriptive hyperlinks, each representing a category of content, rather than applications programs as claimed (see column 9, lines 16-24). None of the Figures 2B-4A shows a configuration list as claimed. The cited text at col. 9 line 38 thru col. 11 line 28 describes a "list of hyperlinks" (column 9, lines 17-19). A list of hyperlinks is not a configuration list as claimed.

A further reading of the cited text and examination of the cited figures reveals that Figure 4A is described as showing a "URL matching table". The URL matching table shows how Martin merely navigates to various Web addresses based on the device being used. The URL matching table is not a configuration list as claimed.

To continue examining the cited text, a list of choices on the mobile device is discussed at column 10, line 66-column 11, line 3. Although the list of choices is not more specifically described, an edited list is used to generate an appropriate menu for the requesting device, which is further discussed though column 11, line 28. The menu is described as if it is the same as the list of hyperlinks as illustrated, for example in Figures 3B and 3A (as the mobile navigation metaphor). Neither the described list of choices nor the menu is a configuration list as claimed. In summary, Martin fails to disclose at least a configuration list including information identifying a user and information identifying

Atty. Docket No.: ORTV.P003

Patent 09/872,485

one or more applications programs associated with the user, and therefore claim 1 is not anticipated by Martin.

Regarding independent claim 10 as amended, Applicants respectfully submit that the argument above with reference to claim 1 is applicable here. Applicants respectfully submit that because Martin does not teach the above-quoted limitation of a user configuration list, claim 10 is not anticipated by Martin.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-14 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Martin in view of Lincke et al. (U.S. Patent 6,397,259). Applicants initially submit that Lincke does not supply the deficiency of Martin in that Lincke fails to teach or suggest a user configuration list as disclosed and claimed. Because independent claims 1 and 10 are allowable over Martin and/or Lincke taken alone or together, independent claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-14 and 16-18 are allowable as depending from respective allowable claims and including yet further limitations on the allowable independent claims. Nonetheless, Applicants will briefly address the Examiner's comments.

Regarding claim 2, the Office Action cites Lincke as teaching that the intermediate system receives a message having a header and a body, the header identifying the user, and the body identifying an action and an application program associated with the user and the action. Applicants respectfully submit that Lincke does not teach the claimed limitation. With reference to column 78, lines 45-53, for example, Lincke discloses a CML form in which the "Text" field indicates a URL to be navigated to. The "Text" in the illustration of the CML form is worded "action = "http://www.server.com/cgi-bin/submit", but Applicants assert that Lincke does not disclose either 1) a body; or 2) an action as claimed. Notwithstanding the fact that Lincke does not disclose a body or an action as claimed, Lincke does not supply the deficiencies of Martin. Therefore, claim 2 is patentable as depending from a patentable claim and adding further limitations thereto. In addition, one of ordinary skill in the art would find no motivation to combine Martin with the CML form of Lincke to achieve the

Atty. Docket No.: ORTV.P003

Patent 09/872,485

claimed invention. Therefore, the invention of claim 2 would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in view of Martin and Lincke.

Regarding claim 3, Applicants initially submit that claim 3 is patentable as depending from a patentable claim and adding further limitations thereto. Applicants further submit that the CML form of Lincke is not the message of claim 3. As Applicants describe in the specification, the intermediate system receives messages in a transport protocol, rather than a mobile device mark-up language such as CML. Therefore, Lincke does not disclose a message body as claimed. The combination of Lincke and Martin does not yield the claimed invention, and claim 3 would not have been obvious in view of the cited references.

Regarding claims 4 and 5, Applicants initially submit that claims 4 and 5 are patentable as depending from a patentable claim and adding further limitations thereto. Applicants assert that Lincke does not supply the significant deficiencies of Martin with respect to claim 1. Therefore, the combination of Martin and Lincke does not yield the invention of claims 4 or 5. For these reasons Applicants submit the invention of claims 4 and 5 would not have been obvious in view of the references.

Regarding claim 7, Applicants initially submit that claim 7 is patentable as depending from a patentable claim and adding further limitations thereto. Applicants further respectfully submit that the cited sections of the Lincke disclosure do not disclose a header identifying the user by a login identification as claimed. Lincke further fails to disclose a body identifying an action and an application program associated with the user and the action. Lincke and Martin together do not teach the invention of claim 7. Therefore, claim 7 would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the references.

Regarding claim 8, Applicants initially submit that claim 8 is patentable as depending from a patentable claim and adding further limitations thereto. Applicants further respectfully submit that Martin does not disclose a configuration list as claimed. For example, the figures cited show variously, the screen display for the mobile device (Figures 3B and 4B), the mobile device metaphor (Figure 3A), a URL matching table

Atty. Docket No.: ORTV.P003

Patent 09/872,485

(Figure 4A), and various information on link server 114 and host server 128, such as user info Sub#, etc. (Figure 2B). None of the indicated figures or text teaches a configuration list with all of the information claimed. If the information exists in Martin, it is not taught or suggested in a single configuration table. Therefore, claim 8 would not have been obvious in view of the cited references.

Regarding claim 9, Applicants initially submit that claim 9 is patentable as depending from a patentable claim and adding further limitations thereto. Applicants further respectfully submit that Martin does not teach a change configuration action in the claimed configuration list. Without more, Martin's failure to disclose a configuration list indicates that claim 9 is patentable over the prior art. In addition, however, the configuration change disclosed by Martin is a change to the list of URLs on the mobile device menu or metaphor. This is distinguishable from the claimed configuration change, which changes a configuration block as in Figure 7 of the specification, which includes at least a config_name, a password, a type, a server, a server_type, a userid, etc. Therefore, one of ordinary skill would receive no guidance from Martin regarding configuration or changing configuration as claimed. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claim 9 would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in view of Martin.

Regarding claim 11, Applicants respectfully apply the reasoning set out above with reference to claim 2.

Regarding claim 12, Applicants respectfully apply the reasoning set out above with reference to claim 3.

Regarding claim 13, Applicants respectfully apply the reasoning set out above with reference to claim 4.

Regarding claim 14, Applicants respectfully apply the reasoning set out above with reference to claim 5.

Regarding claim 16 Applicants respectfully apply the reasoning set out above with reference to claim 7.

Regarding claim 17, Applicants respectfully apply the reasoning set out above with reference to claim 8.

Atty. Docket No.: ORTV.P003

Patent 09/872,485

Regarding claim 18, Applicants respectfully apply the reasoning set out above with reference to claim 9.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-30 are in condition for allowance. The allowance of the claims is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if there are any issues that remain to be resolved prior to allowance of the claims.

AUTHORIZATION TO CHARGE DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

Please charge deposit account 501914 for any fees due in connection with this Office Action response.

Respectfully submitted,
Shernwell Gregory & Courtney LLP

Date: July 13, 2004
Barbara B. Courtney, Reg. No. 42,442
Tel. 408-236-6647